he designs the arrangement of houses, and sheds, and stables, and breweries, and prisons, and all kinds of buildings, and their construction; he estimates, superintends, surveys; and, *perhaps* (if it should be so) he adds a little of *real* Architecture to all this. You count a man who could not write a Specification of works, or who could not detect frauds in building, not an Architect?

Mr. Heavy. Certainly.

Mr. Newl. Then I do not. The Architect who writes a Specification does so in a capacity which, I hope I have shewn you, is not that of an Architect."

"And truly I think there is room for some improved division of labour here; whereby the real Architect might be relieved from the inspection of sewers and cesspools and wells, and the shoring up of old houses, and the rating of dilapidations, and the ventilation of foul cellars, and the fitting up of stables, and the curing of smoky chimneys, and the exclusion of rats, and all such like 'Architecture;' and entrusted with the design of much of the decoration which is at present confided to the painter, upholsterer, cabinet-maker. The *Art* of the house would thus be more thoroughly performed; and (however '*practical*' some 'Architects' may pretend to be) the other matters would be also more 'practically' effected by persons of different general calling."

Now it is not only practically and professionally that there is no such line of distinction, but it is our object to shew that an attempt to mark it would be prejudicial to that department which the author has sought to amend. Mr. Kerr has availed himself of the ordinary tactics of argument, and he might have extended his catalogue of the drudgery of practice to a much greater length. But, if the art of the Beautiful in building is to be a profession, and not merely a subject for discourses, as much drudgery will be found to be inseparable from it as from every other pursuit in life. In all, the art, the scientific invention, or the exercise of imagination, as the case may be, will bear a proportion small indeed compared with the actual work of hands, or with that order of intellectual work, which, from its nature, or its constant recurrence, is almost mechanical. The barrister might, we think, regret that the philosophy of law, and the inquiry into principles, could find little place in his attention. Amongst the routine of practice, the surgeon meets with few "interesting cases," which can either improve his own knowledge or admit of original treatment.

"O'er all, alas! the shade of earth will cling,"

and "art" must be a profession or "calling in life," and our inquiry must be, how it can be best advanced, through that which must remain its medium. We may regret, that many who usurp the title of artists have no claim from merit to rank with those of "our art," but the *real* artist, whether he have "the calling," or seek merely the improvement of art, must work with the sweat of the brow. It is the accompaniment of humanity, from which no pursuit and no "calling" is absolved, and many which we might deem free, are, could we look within, more mechanical and practical than the art of architecture. To what then would Mr. Kerr's arguments tend practically? He would raise up a new class of professors, who might be restricted to one department, but he fails to prove that the *art* of architecture even would be served thereby. Nay, we do not understand how the art could at all reach existence. "Anglo-protestantism," as Mr. Kerr himself says, to take an instance, "Anglo-protestantism, the established religion of England, requires *churches*. (I state the matter *a la* plain common sense). Those churches have certain requirements for the purposes of the services therein to be performed. The building is for the services,—the requirements of the services are the purposes of the building." Consequently, they require a certain arrangement, that is the first thing to be considered, and it admits of no sacrifice. Who is to be applied to? Mr. Kerr, if consisteot, would say a professor of constructioo, *not* a professor of the art; *we* say the architect. From the first imaginary individual, out of many different arrangements, equally eligible, it would be matter of chance whether one would be capable of artistic treatment; from the second the *art* of the building with the constructive design would move *pari passu*. Mr. Kerr would say, we only take the balance of his arguments *pro* and *con*,—that, in the arrangement of the plan, the art of architecture was not called in:—the designer had little title to the rank of artist if it was not. As we have said in a former notice, it is not correct to say that architecture, even the "art," "has its province merely in *appearance*;" and does not the impossibility of detecting any boundary between architecture and construction compel, without use of arguments, the association of art, science, and practice in one profession. But Mr. Kerr has felt, that he had in some degree incurred the *onus* of explaining what were those "laws of nature and reason, the true standards of truth and the beautiful," which he inculcates, as the only source of art. And here he so far counteracts the tenor of his former arguments, that we cannot do better than give what so entirely agrees with our own views, in his words.

"The proper method of training *to forming the mind-mechanism for the design of Architecture* is a subject for deep philosophical inquiry; and is, I think, worthy of it.

The *Requirements* in a building must be made fundamental in the arrangement of it, and therefore in the arrangement of the Architectural design. And this has concealed in it much that may not at first sight appear. It is a fault with us that we arrange our plans too much by *model*, and too little by *requirement as a fundamental*. And I am convinced that if the true arrangements for the ends in view were to be carefully examined into, there would arise a variety in general and particular ideas, of plan, mass, and detail, which would be not only valuable but surprising. This, then, is one subject for study and education.

Construction must be a fundamental principle."

"These fundamentals, Requirement and Construction, are such as I call the principles of Nature and Reason. But they must be much more deeply studied, than our "Architects" study them, and very differently studied, before their usefulness can be discerned; and much more scientifically applied, before the good effects of their application can be seen. And it is by such principles as these, the true Rules of Architecture, that we are to criticise design."

He then alludes to other principles—those of *fitness and propriety*, pictorial *effect*, and *proportion*—and the result to which we at length arrive is, that Mr. Kerr's object and opinions, and our own, *must be* identical.

But it is, notwithstanding, our duty to consider what impression Mr. Kerr's book will have upon the minds of those who may not be ready, or able, to canvas the opinions it contains; and whilst commending its object, and the manner in which that object is in a great degree carried out, to counteract accidental errors in a manner not less prominent. We deem that there is much in the "Discourses" which would tend not only to the injury of the profession, but through that medium to the injury of the art. It should be our object to take every means of laying before the world the substantial benefits which the profession can render to clear away the ignorance which exists as to the nature of the architect's profession and labours. These benefits would be in matters which Mr. Kerr will not admit within the scope of architecture; but, practically, there would be a still further, a constant loss of opportunities of displaying the graces of the art. Few architects would say that the Institute is "too professional," however they might think as to Mr. Kerr's other grounds of cavil. Let the Institute set forth a proper statement of the course of education required for the architect, inquire what are the impediments to the success of architects, procure the recognition of architecture as a profession, set forth publicly its duties, its advantages, and its rights, and it will in this way not only disarm the attacks, for which now there may be reason, not only provide for excellence in construction, but in art, not only for personal benefit, but for the public welfare.

We have before endeavoured to shew that the comprehensive nature of architecture was a matter not sufficiently considered. It is, indeed, *all* that Mr. Kerr has set forth as *not* constituting "Architecture;" it is far more than that. Professor Donaldson was perfectly right when he used a few words of censure for the lack of what is called "engineering knowledge" amongst architects. Architecture includes engineering; and he might too have shewn how the art suffers from the existence of a separate class, seldom professing any knowledge of art; indeed, often contemning its principles, which might otherwise impose a salutary check upon extravagant outlay, and upon that mistaken view of the object of professional aid, which seeks the tortuous course only because it involves greater skill, often in preference to that which might produce greater beauty at less expense. Indeed, it seems to us that the union of art and science is a happy union for the advantage of each; and without the present combination of science and practice with art, architecture would be little more than matter for the *nugæ* of pamphleteers, or the impossible compositions of an exhibition. The art of architecture does not exist on paper.—To ensure the advantage of the art the profession must be *maintained*; and this is often effected, and must always be, as in parallel cases, by matters having little of art in their composition. It is to *architects*—those who are actually engaged in practice—that we must look for sound criticism, not such as, for want of sufficient attention on their part, has become the staple of the newspapers, some of the set phrases of which Mr. Kerr has quoted. The artist and the constructive agent must therefore be the same individual; and Mr. Kerr shews that *he* is perfectly familiar with the practice of architecture. The forms which construction takes in every detail, make, or influence, the art; they are matters of work, are mechanical, but essential to both art and science, and must be under one direction. The architect *should* bestow more of his own labour on his designs; and if we add to this, the design of the internal decoration, of all that now falls to the hands of the upholsterer, and, indeed, of every thing requiring construction or design in the formation, fitting, and furnishing of buildings, it will be seen that our idea of the pursuit of architecture varies much from that which the "Newleafe Discourses" teach.

And if we are told that it is impossible for the human intellect to grasp all these various subjects, we answer, that no limit has yet been found to the capacities of genius. There is no extent of professional knowledge which good system in education would not grasp,—no amount of business or labour which industry and order would not get through. We like that saying of Reynolds, and would gild it in every school of art-education,—"Nothing is denied to well-directed labour—nothing is to be attained without it." The names of Michael Angelo, Da Vinci, and Raphael, in art, or of Shakspeare, in poetry, were not those of men whom we may not parallel,—names which the present age may not surpass.—But we must defer these important subjects, as sufficiently important to claim careful thought, for future notice, but will not conclude this article without again recommending Mr. Kerr's book to our readers.

IMPORTANT TO LONDON BUILDERS AND ARCHITECTS.

PROJECTION OF SHOP-FRONTS, &c.

In the case of a shop-front, put up in Roan-street, Greenwich, by Mr. Sugden, builder, the district-surveyor objected to "the cornice, &c., of shop front and window dressings to the house nearest Skelton-street, overhanging and encroaching upon the public way contrary to Schedule E," and ultimately took the question to the referees.

At the meeting "it was admitted on the part of John Sugden, that the house referred to is a building built since the 1st January, 1845."

The referees awarded, "that the walls of the building in question ought to have been set back, so that all projections intended to be made therefrom should only *overhang or occupy the ground of the owner of such building, without overhanging or encroaching upon the public way*; and inasmuch as the walls of the building in question stand up to the public way, it was contrary to the said first-mentioned Metropolitan Buildings Act to erect any shop front before the walls of such building, of which the front wall stands, or of which any other walls stand up to the public way, so as to encroach upon such public way, or to put

For info on PDF Compression and OCR go to our website